

are effectively investigated and prosecuted. In addition, it will ensure that Federal investigations and prosecutions are carried out when local authorities request assistance or are unwilling or unable to effectively prosecute cases.

It is important that the Federal Government have the ability to take aggressive action against hate crimes in States where current laws are inadequate. For example, only 31 States and the District of Columbia include sexual orientation-based or disability-based crimes in their hate crimes statutes. This law will help ensure that all hate crimes are fully investigated and prosecuted.

This measure, which has strong bipartisan support, would strengthen existing law in two ways. First, it would eliminate a serious limitation on Federal involvement under existing law—namely, the requirement that a victim of a hate crime was attacked because he or she was engaged in federally-protected activity such as voting or attending school. It also would authorize the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute hate crimes based on sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or disability. Current law does not provide authority for involvement in these four categories.

Hate crimes are un-American. They cannot be tolerated. When individuals are targeted and attacked because of who they are, entire communities suffer and we are all diminished by it.

S. 1105 would give us the tools we need to be more effective in combating crimes of hate. The House passed its version of hate crimes legislation on May 3 and now the Senate must do our part. I call on my colleagues to support S. 1105 and I urge its passage without further delay.

#### MILITARY COMMISSIONS ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, first of all, thank you for taking some time and presiding in the chair so I can make this statement.

Last year, I made a very difficult decision. I voted for the Military Commissions Act because I believed it would make our Nation safer and help us fight the war on terrorism. I did not support the bill, however, without reservations.

I said at the time it was not the law I would have written. To the contrary, I supported the bill with the understanding we would go back and fix some of the problems that remained unsolved. Tomorrow, the Senate has an opportunity to fix one of the most glaring of those problems, the failure to provide detainees with the right to habeas corpus.

A right to habeas corpus was a fundamental right in the eyes of our Founding Fathers. It was seen as a mechanism for accountability within our

Government, giving prisoners a way to challenge detentions that were unlawful or unconstitutional.

A right to habeas corpus has remained a cornerstone of our criminal justice system since our very beginning as a Nation. It continues to be reaffirmed time and time again by every court in the land. Granting all prisoners the right to petition for habeas corpus is something that makes our Nation special and sets us apart.

Now, I am sure many Americans may wonder: Well, what is habeas corpus? What is the big fuss about this habeas corpus thing? Well, let me try to explain.

Habeas corpus gives a person, a citizen, people, the right to ensure they are being held by the Government lawfully, that they were not the victim of malfeasance or misfeasance on the part of the Government. It is not an easy standard to meet, and it is not taken lightly by the court system.

To make a case for habeas corpus requires a significant amount of proof that a detention of that individual violates the laws of the United States. Let me say that one more time. Proving that you are entitled to relief, proving that you are entitled to a writ of habeas corpus by the court, is not an easy task.

The claim is usually denied. Only those who truly deserve the writ are able to obtain it. I say this to reassure those who may feel that granting detainees the right to habeas corpus, as the amendment would do, would quickly let loose those who would then attack our country and our citizens. That simply will not happen.

What will happen is those detainees who are being held unlawfully, if there are any who are being held unlawfully, who are being denied their basic human rights, will have a chance to make their case in court. They will, for the first time, be able to argue they are being held without any evidence of wrongdoing. They will be able to argue, possibly, they were tortured for a confession that is simply not true.

In short, they will be allowed to hold our great Nation to the standard of fairness, lawfulness, and decency that our Founding Fathers established when they penned the U.S. Constitution.

Some people may not believe detainees are entitled to such a basic right. They argue these people may not be U.S. citizens; that they do not believe the Constitution provides them with any protection or any guarantees.

I disagree. I would ask those people one thing: If the terrorists convince us to throw away the very rights that make us free, the very rights that make our Nation what we uniquely are, does that not mean the terrorists have won?

If we believe in the rule of law, and if we believe in a system of justice, we must give all people detained by our Government the right to challenge that detention. Our Government must play by the rules. It must detain people

who are supposed to be detained, and it must be prepared to make that case in a court of law.

The United States can do better than depending on indefinite, unchallengeable detentions to imprison an individual suspected to be a terrorist. We do not need shortcuts to keep our Nation safe.

We can fight the war on terror and respect human rights at the same time. What makes America worthy of fighting for and dying for is the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It sets us apart from the rest of the world, and we cannot permit its erosion or its undermining. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights need to be preserved.

Therefore, I intend to fully support the Leahy-Specter amendment that will be offered tomorrow to restore habeas rights to detainees. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

#### EULOGY FOR HOWARD GITTIS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, a very close, personal friend and a great American died the day before yesterday, Howard Gittis, a very distinguished Philadelphia lawyer in the great tradition of Andrew Hamilton who defended Peter Zenger. Those of us who are Philadelphia lawyers take great pride in that tradition from Andrew Hamilton and the historic defense of Peter Zenger, and Howard Gittis was in that mold.

I have been a personal friend of Howard Gittis for some 50 years. I was told he went to sleep on Sunday night and didn't awaken, died in his sleep apparently of a heart attack.

Howard Gittis was a partner in the very prestigious firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen for some 23 years. He then joined a noted entrepreneur, Ronald Perelman of New York, and was the executive vice president of McAndrews & Forbes in New York City.

Howard was noted for his charitable contributions both as an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, where he contributed substantially to Penn's law school which named Gittis Hall and the Gittis Center for Clinical Legal Studies at Penn in honor of Howard Gittis's contribution to the law school and his charitable support of the university.

Not only did he support the University of Pennsylvania, but he also served on the board of Temple University for 31 years, including 5 as chairman of the board, and the Temple Student Center is named for him.

Always affable, always cheerful, always ready to lend assistance to friends or even to those who were not close friends. He left an indelible mark in the Philadelphia legal community and in the New York business community.

His funeral services occurred earlier today in New York and burial occurred this afternoon in Philadelphia.